APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,316	09/15/2003	Paul S. Diefenbaugh	42P17654	1317

8791   7590   12/27/2007
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER
XIAO, KE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/663,316	DIEFENBAUGH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ke Xiao	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 October 2007</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1,4-12,14-22,25-32,35-42 and 44-50* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1,4-12,14-22,25-32,35-42 and 44-50* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16-18, 21, 22, 25 and 27-29 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Aleksic (US 2003/0210221).

Regarding independent **Claim 1**, Aleksic teaches a method comprising:

determining an ambient light level for an operating environment of a display

device having an adjustable backlight to provide variable brightness (Aleksic, Fig. 4

elements 405, 436, 440, 445, Pg. 3 paragraph [0028]);

modifying pixel color intensity values corresponding to of one or more portions of

an image to be displayed on the display deice based on the ambient light level (Aleksic,

Pg. 3 paragraph [0029]); and

modifying the backlight intensity based on the modified pixel color intensity

values wherein modification to the backlight intensity approximately offsets the

modification to the pixel color intensity values (Aleksic, Pg. 3 paragraphs [0028-0030]).

Regarding independent **Claim 12**, Aleksic teaches a method comprising:

determining an ambient light level fro a display device having an adjustable

backlight to provide variable backlight intensity (Aleksic, Fig. 4 elements 405, 436, 440,

445, Pg. 3 paragraph [0028]);

modifying the backlight intensity based on the ambient light level (Aleksic, Fig. 4

elements 405, 436, 440, 445, Pg. 3 paragraph [0028]); and

modifying pixel color intensity values corresponding to one or more portions of

an image to be displayed on the display device based on the modified intensity of the

adjustable backlight (Aleksic, Pg. 3 paragraph [0029]); and

wherein modification to the pixel color intensity values approximately offsets the

modification to the backlight intensity (Aleksic, Pg. 3 paragraphs [0028-0030]).

Regarding independent **Claim 22**, Aleksic teaches an apparatus comprising:

an ambient light sensor to generate signals indicating a sensed ambient light

level (Aleksic, Fig. 4 element 445);

a display device having an adjustable backlight source (Aleksic, Fig. 4 element

136 and 440); and

a graphics control device coupled with the ambient light sensor on the display

device, the graphics control device to modify pixel color intensity values corresponding

to one or more portions of an image and backlight intensity based on the sensed

ambient light level (Aleksic, Fig. 4 element 440);

wherein the graphics control device modifies backlight intensity based on the sensed ambient light level and modifies the pixel color intensity values corresponding to one or more portions of an image to be displayed on the display device based on the modified backlight intensity (Aleksic, Fig. 4 elements 440, 450 and 455, Pg. 2 paragraph [0021] Pg. 4 paragraphs [0034-0035]).

Regarding **Claims 4 and 14**, Aleksic further teaches that determining the ambient light level comprises receiving a signal from an ambient light sensor indicating the ambient light level (Aleksic, Pg. 3 paragraphs [0028-0029]).

Regarding **Claims 7 and 17**, Aleksic further teaches wherein modifying the backlight intensity comprises modifying a pulse width modulation signal that controls backlight illumination (Aleksic, Pg. 2 paragraph 0021]).

Regarding **Claims 8 and 18**, Aleksic further teaches wherein modifying the backlight intensity comprises:

determining a hardware register value corresponding to a baseline backlight intensity value (Aleksic, Fig. 4 element 142);

applying a software generated value to the register value to generate a modified backlight intensity value (Aleksic, Fig. 4 element 440); and

using the modified backlight intensity value to cause the backlight intensity to be modified (Aleksic, Fig. 4 element 450).

Regarding **Claims 11 and 21**, Aleksic further teaches wherein the hardware

register value is stored in a register within a peripheral component interconnect

configuration space (Aleksic, Fig. 4 element 142).

Regarding **Claims 16**, Aleksic further teaches wherein modifying the pixel color

intensity values comprises modifying a pixel color using a graphics controller look-up

table prior to passing the pixel to the display device (Aleksic, Fig. 4 elements 440 and

455, Pg. 4 paragraphs [0034-0035]).

Regarding **Claim 25**, Aleksic further teaches wherein the display device

comprises a flat-panel liquid crystal display (Aleksic, Pg. 4 paragraph [0031]).

Regarding **Claim 27**, Aleksic further teaches that the graphics control device

comprises:

a backlight control circuit coupled with the adjustable backlight source to control

the intensity of backlight provided by the adjustable backlight source (Aleksic, Fig. 4

element 440); and

a display control circuit coupled with the ambient light sensor and the backlight

control circuit to apply an adjustment to a baseline backlight including at least the

sensed ambient light level to generated a modified backlight intensity signal (Aleksic,

Fig. 4 element 142);

wherein the backlight control circuit causes the adjustable backlight source to

provide a backlight intensity corresponding to the modified backlight intensity value

(Aleksic, Fig. 4 elements 142, 440 and 450).

Regarding **Claim 28,** Aleksic further teaches that the backlight control circuit

provides a pulse width modulated signal to the adjustable backlight source to control

the intensity of the backlight provided by the adjustable backlight source (Aleksic, Pg. 2

paragraph 0021]).

Regarding **Claim 29,** Aleksic further teaches that the baseline backlight intensity

is retrieved from a register coupled with the backlight controller (Aleksic, Fig. 4, 142).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented
> and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aleksic

(US 2003/0210221) in view of Wada (US 2002/0154138).

Regarding **Claim 6,** Aleksic fails to teach that modifying the pixel color intensity

values comprises modifying a color look-up table. Wada teaches adjusting color

brightness by modifying a color look-up table (Wada, Fig. 4, Pg. 2 paragraphs [0034-

0039]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to have used the method of modifying a color look-up table to adjust pixel

color intensity as taught by Wada in the device of Aleksic in order to allow the user

more precise control over the color adjustment.

Claims 5, 9, 10, 15, 19, 20, 30-32, 35-42 and 44-50 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aleksic (US 2003/0210221) in view of Lin (US

6,618,045).

Regarding independent **Claim 32**, Aleksic teaches one or more processing

devices (Aleksic, Fig. 4) which:

determine an ambient light level for a display device having an adjustable

backlight to provide variable backlight intensity (Aleksic, Fig. 4 element 445);

modify pixel color intensity values corresponding to of one or more portions of an

image to be displayed on the display device based on the ambient light level (Aleksic,

Fig. 4 element 440, 457, and 455); and

modify the backlight intensity based on the modified pixel color intensity values

wherein modification to the backlight intensity approximately offsets the modification to

the pixel color intensity values (Aleksic, Fig. 4 elements 440, 450 and 455, Pg. 2

paragraph [0021] Pg. 4 paragraphs [0034-0035]).

Aleksic fails to teach an article comprising a computer-readable medium having

stored thereon instructions that, when executed, cause the one or more processing

devices to perform the above functions.

Lin teaches that modifying color, brightness, and/or contrast can be done

through any combination of software or hardware (Lin, Fig. 3, Col. 3 lines 59-63).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to use a computer-readable medium having stored thereon instructions

that, when executed causes the one or more processing devices to perform any

function as taught by Lin instead of the hardware described by Aleksic because

software implementation would provided added flexibility to the system of Aleksic.

Regarding independent **Claim 42**, Aleksic teaches one or more computing

devices (Aleksic, Fig. 4) used to:

determine an ambient light level for a display device having an adjustable

backlight to provide variable backlight intensity (Aleksic, Fig. 4 element 445);

modify the backlight intensity based on the ambient light level (Aleksic, Fig. 4

element 440); and

modify pixel color intensity values corresponding to or one or more portions of

an image to be displayed on the display device based on the modified intensity of the

adjustable backlight (Aleksic, Fig. 4 element 440 and 457);

wherein modification to the pixel color intensity values approximately offsets the

modification to the backlight intensity (Aleksic, Fig. 4 elements 440, 450 and 455, Pg. 2

paragraph [0021] Pg. 4 paragraphs [0034-0035]).

Aleksic fails to teach an article comprising a computer-readable medium having

stored thereon instructions that, when executed, cause the one or more processing

devices to perform the above functions.

Lin teaches that modifying color, brightness, and/or contrast can be done through any combination of software or hardware (Lin, Fig. 3, Col. 3 lines 59-63). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a computer-readable medium having stored thereon instructions that, when executed causes the one or more processing devices to perform any function as taught by Lin instead of the hardware described by Aleksic because software implementation would provide added flexibility to the system of Aleksic.

Regarding **Claims 35 and 44**, Aleksic in view of Lin further teaches wherein the instructions that cause the one or more processing devices to determine the ambient light level comprise instructions that, when executed, cause the one or more processing devices to receive a signal from an ambient light sensor indicating the ambient light level (Aleksic, Fig. 4 element 440).

Regarding **Claims 36 and 45**, Aleksic fails to teach instructions as claimed. Lin further teaches instructions that cause one or more processing devices to determine the ambient light level comprising instructions that, when executed, cause the one or more processing devices to receive user input (Lin, Col. 5 lines 5-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have further used the instructions as taught by Lin in the display system of Aleksic in order to allow specific adjustment as set by the user (Lin, Col. 5 lines 5-33).

Regarding **Claims 37 and 46**, Aleksic in view of Lin further teaches that the instructions that cause the one or more processing devices to modify the pixel color

intensity values comprise instructions that, when executed, cause the one or more

processing devices to adjust the pixel luminance, using a color look-up table (Aleksic,

Pg. 4 paragraphs [0034-0035]).

Regarding **Claims 38 and 47**, Aleksic in view of Lin further teaches that the

instructions that cause one or more processing devices to modify the backlight intensity

comprise instructions that, when executed, cause the one or more processing devices

to modify a pulse width modulation signal that controls backlight illumination (Aleksic,

Pg. 2 paragraph 0021]).

Regarding **Claims 39 and 48**, Aleksic in view of Lin further teaches that the

instructions that cause one or more processing devices to modify the backlight intensity

further comprise instructions that, when executed, cause the one or more processing

devices to:

determine a hardware register value corresponding to a baseline backlight

intensity value (Aleksic, Fig. 4 element 122);

apply a software generated value to the register value to generated a modified

backlight intensity value (Aleksic, Fig. 4 element 440); and

use the modified backlight intensity value to cause the backlight intensity to be

modified (Aleksic, Fig. 4 element 455).

Regarding **Claims 5 and 15**, Aleksic fails to teach that determining the ambient

light level comprises receiving a user input. Lin teaches that determining the ambient

light level comprises receiving a user input (Lin, Col. 5 lines 5-33). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the

input of Aleksic as taught by Lin in order to allow specific adjustment as set by the user

(Lin, Col. 5 lines 5-33).

Regarding **Claims 9, 19, 30, 40 and 49**, Aleksic fails to teach that the baseline

backlight intensity value is determined based on a user provided input. Lin teaches that

baseline settings can be determined based on user provided input (Lin, Col. 5 lines 34-

45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to base the baseline backlight intensity as taught by Aleksic on a user

provided input as taught by Lin in order to save power (Lin, Col. 5 lines 34-45).

Regarding **Claim 10, 20, 31, 41 and 50**, Aleksic fails to teach that the baseline

backlight intensity value is determined based on a power state of the display device. Lin

teaches that baseline settings can be determined based a power state of the display

device (Lin, Col. 5 lines 34-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to base the baseline backlight intensity as taught by

Aleksic on a power state of the display device as taught by Lin in order to save power

(Lin, Col. 5 lines 34-45).

Claims 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Aleksic (US 2003/0210221) in view of Kim (US 2004/0156183).

Regarding **Claim 26**, Aleksic fails to teach that the display device comprises a

plasma display device. Instead Aleksic teaches a liquid crystal display device. Kim

teaches plasma display devices can be interchangeable with liquid crystal devices when applying backlight technology (Kim, Pg. 5 paragraph [0086]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the display device of Aleksic with the plasma display device as taught by Kim because plasma display devices have higher contrast ratios.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 25th, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding independent Claims 1, 12, 22, 32 and 42, the applicant argues:

Aleksic fails to teach "modifying color pixel intensity", specifically Aleksic teaches correcting for color constancy which is chrominance instead of luminance. The examiner respectfully disagrees. According to the applicant's specification as well as dependent claims, color pixel intensity does not relate only to the intensity of the colors but the actual ratio and color values of the different backlights and values used. Therefore the examiner considered the interpretation proper and the rejection is maintained.

The applicant makes no further arguments regarding the remaining claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ke Xiao whose telephone number is (571)272-7776. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on (571) 272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

December 10, 2007 - kx -

SUMATI LEFKOWITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER